

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VI

MAY 1911

NUMBER 8

Editorial

TWO IMPORTANT RESOLUTIONS

At the recent meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at St. Louis, two resolutions were introduced and passed, to which, because of their general interest and importance, we wish to give editorial sanction and prominence. It is earnestly to be hoped that the support of scholars and institutions as well as private individuals of wealth who have so often come to the assistance of the cause of scholarship and culture may be found ready to meet the present emergency as outlined in the first resolution. The reasonableness and desirability of the object of the second resolution should commend it to those bodies to whom it is addressed; and, though the difficulties in the way of the end desired are obvious and great, it is to be hoped that the proposed joint committee will be duly appointed and the way cleared for this needed reform.

EXCAVATIONS IN ASIA MINOR

WHEREAS, The preservation of priceless monuments of history and archaeology is seriously imperiled by the rapid advancement of commercial enterprise in Asia Minor; and

WHEREAS, All that untold wealth of material for the better understanding of the civilizations represented by Babylon, Greece, Rome, and early Christianity can be saved only by immediate, continuous, and systematic exploration and excavation; be it

Resolved, That the Classical Association of the Middle West and South hereby expresses its approval of the splendid plans outlined by Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett of Cornell University for not only the surface exploration, but also the thorough excavation of important sites of Asia Minor, and its eager hope

that some richly endowed American institution or some American citizen of wealth will come to the rescue with a subvention adequate to save from destruction that vast and wonderful material in imminent danger of being forever lost.

UNIFORM GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

We, members of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, assembled in St. Louis at the annual meeting for the year 1911, desire to express our cordial approval of the movement already begun by two educational bodies in America for the harmonizing of grammatical nomenclature and our strong interest in its success.

In order that the work in all its interrelations may most successfully be accomplished, we beg to request the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association, and the American Philological Association to arrange a joint committee for the study of grammatical terminology, and the framing of a consistent system; the members of this committee to be divided as evenly as possible among the three bodies, and also to represent as evenly as possible the school and college alike, provision being made at the same time for representation of the side of school superintendence.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

At a meeting of the Executive Committee held at St. Louis on Saturday, April 8, the following amendment to the constitution was presented: "That the provision whereby the vice-president of the Association is also the vice-president for his own state be stricken from the constitution." By the provisions of the constitution, this amendment will be acted on at the next annual meeting.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

The New England meeting, an account of which is given under "Current Events," was in every way successful. The large attendance, the generous hospitality of the officers of Phillips Academy and citizens of Exeter, and the high quality of the papers combined to make the meeting a notable one in the history of the Association. The entertainment of the members at the Academy dormitories and the meals together at the commons gave a social quality to the gathering that has been missed at some of the earlier

meetings. A pleasant feature of the provision for the guests was the service of a corps of volunteer student helpers, whose courteous attention was greatly appreciated. The Association was glad to receive greetings from the Association of the Middle West and South brought by Professor Laing, and from the Association of the Atlantic States by Professors Knapp and Rolfe.

The tendency in the New England Association has been to give increasing attention to topics of scholarly interest rather than to details of method. The selection of topics and speakers by the president, Professor Clifford H. Moore of Harvard University, insured unusual variety of interest, with treatment that combined high scholarship with fine literary form. The whole tendency of the meeting was to send teachers back to their work with quickened appreciation of classical studies in their higher aspects.

The election of Dr. Gallagher of Thayer Academy as president for the coming year insures continued progress for the Association.

C. D. A.

CATULLUS AND HORACE

BY ROY K. HACK
Williams College

Mr. Canter's recent article on Horace's claim to be the first lyric poet of Rome reaches an interesting but (I believe) unsound conclusion; namely, that Catullus is an epigrammatist because his favorite and perfected meters belong to that department; and in the second place, that Catullus' inexperience and lack of skill in those meters which Horace Romanized show the justice of Horace's assertion that he was the first to wed Lesbian rhythm to the Latin tongue.

This seems to me to be "criticism of the horse in terms of the ass." Mr. Canter constantly appeals to "departmental tradition" to prove his assertions, whereas one of the most beautiful and encouraging characteristics of genius is that it is always to a certain extent above and outside of departmental tradition. Catullus, as a lyric poet who wrote Latin, is in a class by himself, for us as he was for his fellow-Romans. Now the real significance of Horace's claim and the place that Catullus really holds in Latin literature must lead to a wider consideration of Roman criticism of poetry than is involved in a mere apologia for Horace's phrase "princeps Aeolium Carmen." Before entering on that question, however, I wish briefly to discuss the metrical form and achievements of Catullus and Horace.

Any prolonged debate on terminology is liable to lead away from essentials; therefore I shall merely repeat what everyone knows, that Catullus wrote not only epigrams but elegies, lyrics, and poems in hexameter. Here I must take issue of fact with Mr. Canter. Catullus' "favorite and perfected meters" are not exclusively epigrammatic; and Catullus does not show "inexperience and lack of skill" in the adaptation of the various Greek meters which Horace also used.

In the first place, hendecasyllabics are used by Sappho in her seventh book; and are occasionally found in tragic lyrics (e.g., "Orestes" 831-33), often mingled with glyconics. None has yet asserted that Euripides was guilty of confusing the sacrosanct $\epsilon\delta\eta$ by borrowing an epigrammatic meter. Catullus' choliambics are particularly worthy of notice. In them he adopts a scansion more strict than that of the Greeks, for he does not allow a spondee in the fifth foot. But the history of the meter surely does not justify us in calling it epigrammatic. Neither Hipponax nor Herondas, its chief employers, was an epigrammatist. We must not forget that it is extremely dangerous to attempt to delimit the activities of a poet in a civilization as advanced as that of the last century B.C. Hexameter is of course the meter which belongs to the epic *genre*, but Theocritus, two hundred years before Catullus, used it not merely for brief epic poems, but for love-songs and mimes. Croiset well says that the predominance of the hexameter informs us that all these poems have been written to be read, and that the employment of different meters would have been false art, since there would have been no corresponding difference in the mode of rendering the poems. The *genres* had lost their severity; poems were still recited and sung, but they were much more frequently read. So with Catullus; he saw the possibilities latent in the scazon and expressed through it the most various emotions.

As for the epigram, it is a mystery which we have always with us. Mr. Canter seems to think that all poems which are at once short, simple, clear, and which preserve unity of subject are epigrams. I should be inclined to call this not a definition, but an appreciation, of the epigram. Let me quote again; Mr. Canter speaks on one page of the "easy and unconventional point of view of the epigram," on another of its "simplicity and stately reserve." Can stately reserve and easy unconventionality coexist in the same *genre*? Of course they can; and this unconscious admission on the part of a "departmental critic" shows how difficult it is to force real poetry into hermetically sealed compartments. Mr. Canter's argument breaks down just at this point. He is so eager to differentiate the epigram and the lyric that he proceeds to contrast the simple reserve of the epigram with the "great wealth of compound

epithets, daring similes, cumulative metaphors, and overflowing imagination" of the lyric. Now this is a false contrast; have we so soon forgotten the Lesbians and their half-popular lyricism? I hesitate to recall so plain a distinction as that between the simplicity of form and language in Alcaeus and Sappho, on the one hand, and the artificial diversity of form and jeweled magnificence of style in Pindar and Bacchylides on the other. I need not dwell on a point which is sufficiently elaborated in every school history of Greek literature, but it is certain that the passionate simplicity of Catullus shows him to be essentially akin not to the Alexandrians, nor yet to the merely epigrammatic poets, but to the Lesbians.

The second count concerned the inferiority of Catullus to Horace in the use of the same meters. The metrical impeccability of Horace is proverbial; the exigencies of form often worked to his advantage, and forced him into one of those tortuous felicities which the *impium genus* of sophomores rearrange in "one, two, three, four" order, such, for example, as the

. . . . latentis proditor intimo
gratus puellae risus ab angulo.

Yet sometimes his felicity abandoned him; and the result is one of those lines, with more meter than sense, which commentators pass disdainfully or impotently by. Does the technique of Catullus, considering his youth and the slight amount of work he has left us, deserve to be so unfavorably compared with that of Horace? The two poems in Sapphics seem to be best worth discussion. Mr. Canter says there are three respects in which Catullus follows Sappho's usage more nearly than does Horace: in admitting mono-syllables at the end of a verse, in allowing a trochee in the second foot and at the end of the third verse, and in allowing caesura after either the fifth or the sixth syllable. He might have added that synapheia, which occurs only three times in Horace, was normal with Sappho and Catullus. But Catullus is no mere imitator of Sappho nor is he after all unaware that he is writing in Latin. Macnaghten and Ramsay have pointed out some of the details in which Catullus marks a distinct advance in the composition of Latin Sapphics. He never allows hiatus between one line and the

next (a restriction observed by Horace in the last book of the *Odes*); the second foot in any of the first three lines is never formed by a word or the end of a word; Sappho's long third verse consists of two distinct parts, with a break after the eighth or the ninth syllable, but Catullus' third lines have a steady rhythm. Horace follows Catullus in these respects, and thus assists in the creation of what is really a new stanza. It is hard to resist the conclusion that Horace's "princeps Aeolium carmen" was after all an exaggeration. Horace was no fool; it would be paying him a strange compliment to say that he overlooked or despised the achievements of his predecessor in lyric verse; and our examination has shown that he was well acquainted with Catullus' Sapphics.

One more point, and we are through with meters. Mr. Canter appeals to the "weighty and regular movement of the Latin language" to support his criticism of Catullus' usage in allowing the caesura after either the fifth or the sixth syllable. This may be a trifle, but under this trifle lies a tremendous fallacy, for which (I suppose) Taine's famous dictum of "la race, le milieu et le moment" is ultimately responsible. The argument runs something like this: first characterize the Romans as a weighty and regular people; next say that all literature is a function of national life; then make the obvious deduction that all Roman literature is under a logical obligation to be weighty and regular. Of course such reasoning is at once arbitrary and perfectly circular, but perhaps no better argument is necessary if one is determined to exclude Catullus from some select band of indisputably weighty and regular Roman writers. Take a parallel case: the French, as a nation, are constantly in pursuit of logical and intelligible notions, are fond of generalizations, little given to metaphysics or mysticism. So much do they love precision that they are sometimes dry; and they prefer clarity to depth of thought. But the poetry of Victor Hugo is notably vague and magniloquent; ideas disappear, and in their stead we find images. Has Hugo, for all that, any the less a right to be ranked among French poets, and to take his due place among the other French lyricists? Of course not. Historically considered his verse is the perfect literary expression of the rather confused but lofty aspirations of the French democracy during the last half

of the nineteenth century. It would be useless to insist farther; let us only remember that a poet's relation to his own age and nation is by no means passive. Influenced as he may be by his environment, he is himself an active force in determining that environment.

Seriously, our literary criticism becomes ridiculous whenever we become pseudo-scientists. I have the most profound respect for the formulae which solve problems in mechanics, but no respect whatever for the formulae which darken judgment and hinder us from attaining to the eminently human and unmechanical truths of literature. As a matter of fact, Horace made a bad mistake in strictly placing the caesura after the fifth syllable; a mistake which he tried to retrieve in his fourth book. To deny to a lyric poet the right to speed and passion in his verse is to deny the right of stars to shine—if, that is, they happen to be in the Italian firmament.

I have said above that the real explanation of Horace's attitude toward Catullus involves a greater question. Why is it that, so far as we have record, later Romans said so little of either Lucretius or Catullus? Why did they not stir greater enthusiasm? The one holds a secure place among the greatest lyric poets of antiquity; the other—to quote Sellar—is a “truer type of the strong character and commanding genius of his country than Vergil or Horace.” I dare not attempt so complicated a problem in this paper; I can only mention a few aspects of the puzzle.

Mr. Hendrickson has brilliantly vindicated Cicero from the charge of slighting Lucretius in the “multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis” passage. With that exception, apparently no one appreciated Lucretius until Ovid wrote his enthusiastic “carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti, exitio terras cum dabit una dies.” Horace echoes various phrases, but nowhere mentions the poet himself. Quintilian (10. 1. 87) has a curious passage: “Macer et Lucretius legendi quidem, sed non ut phrasin, id est corpus eloquentiae faciant.” For pedestrian stupidity this deserves to be put beside his only criticism of Catullus, “cuius [iambi] acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio . . . reperietur” (10. 1. 96). Quintilian was a great teacher and in his way a great critic, but hardly appreciated poetry when it was so unadapted

to school use as that of Lucretius or Catullus. For him, their verse had no practical value, since it was wrought out of the agony and joy of their souls. However, it is only fair to remember the danger inherent in any argument from silence; and we may be sure, in spite of the infrequency of references, that some Romans always read and loved the two great Republican poets. Tacitus says in a passing phrase that a few even preferred Lucretius to Vergil.

As for Horace's "princeps Aeolium *carmen*," it may be dealt with in several ways, always provided we do not commit the error of taking it too seriously, just as some theologians construct an entire system upon a single verse of the Bible. Horace was a man and a poet; he was therefore not exempt from jealousy. He may perhaps have been a little vain: it is not unlikely that he may even have done what others have done before and since his time—he may have written that fateful "princeps" for no other reason than that it sounded well.

THE CONSEQUENTS OF THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

BY JOHN C. KIRTLAND
The Phillips Exeter Academy

The editors of the *Journal* have asked me to furnish them with a statement showing the results of the labors of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin. For the sake of completeness, I shall set down all pertinent facts which could not be included in my article on "The Antecedents of the Commission's Report" in the *Journal* for February, 1910.¹

Lest there survive some misapprehension regarding the failure of the American Philological Association to adopt the commission's report, I wish, first of all, to give the reasons for this, though they may easily be inferred from the report itself and from the minutes of the association's meeting in 1909 as printed in its *Transactions and Proceedings* (Vol. XL, p. xi). The association had sanctioned the organization, under its authority, of a commission, whose members were to be selected from the three Classical Associations; it had empowered this commission to formulate definitions of the Latin Requirements, and to further the adoption of these definitions by the colleges. The commission owed its existence to the Philological Association, but was not a committee of that body; it was distinctly instructed to submit its conclusions directly to those who alone could give them effect. The commission properly held back its report until it could be presented to the association, but asked at that time that no formal action be taken on it, for the reasons given above and because the meeting of the association was thought not to be a suitable place for the discussion of the details of college-entrance requirements. The association voted to continue the commission, and appropriated money for its further expenses. I hope this recital

¹ For explanations and advocacy of the report see the writer's papers "The Report of the Commission" (*Classical Journal* for April, 1910) and "The New Latin Requirements" (*ibid.*, June, 1910).

has made it clear that the Philological Association, while it is not to be held responsible for the particulars of the commission's recommendations, did give the commission the warrant which was necessary to its success, and generous support.

Since the date of its report the commission has met twice, at the time of the meetings of the American Philological Association in 1909 and 1910. On the former occasion the only formal action was the passing of a vote (December 28, 1909) requesting colleges which should adopt the new definitions of the requirements to announce this fact before the beginning of the school year 1910-11, and to hold their first examinations under the new plan in 1911. Shortly after this meeting a proposal to adapt the new definitions to the needs of colleges which require less than four years of Latin for admission was submitted to the members of the commission, and on April 23, 1910, in accordance with a unanimous vote, there was issued a definite statement of two-year and three-year requirements.¹ In December, 1910, the commission had several sessions at Providence, and carefully considered suggestions from various sources. One of these, which had been approved at a conference of the representatives of the Latin departments of New England colleges, called for verbal changes in the two-year and three-year requirements; another, offered by Professor Karl P. Harrington, proposed a uniform certificate; others looked to a grouping of the examinations in two papers and a decrease in the reading of the second year. After mature deliberation it was agreed that stability was desirable at this juncture, rather than betterment, since it seemed likely that any change, however excellent in itself, would produce confusion and imperil the attainment of uniformity. The commission voted, therefore, to dissolve without further action, and so reported to the Philological Association.

The commission's report was received everywhere with a great show of satisfaction. Long, favorable editorials appeared in the *Classical Weekly* of January 22, 1910, the *Springfield Republican* of February 17, 1910, the *School Review* for February, 1910, and the *Classical Journal* for the same month. The *Educational*

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for June, 1910, p. 368.

Review for February, 1910, gave the report less space editorially, but no less vigorous support. The letters from Professor J. W. D. Ingersoll and Mr. Henry Preble printed in the *Classical Weekly* of February 5, 1910, are also noteworthy. So far as I know, the only adverse criticism that has been made in print is contained in Mr. William Cranston Lawton's letter in the *Nation* of August 18, 1910, in which he acknowledges that "there is moderate cause for gratitude" in the other options devised by the commission, but objects to legitimating the reading of Sallust in the schools. I quote a few significant sentences from the editorials and letters mentioned above:

Though the western members of the Commission represented a certificate system of entrance to college and the eastern members one of examinations, it soon became evident that what was really desired was the improvement of the system of teaching in the schools, and in this matter the interests of one section were as vital as those of the other. . . . It seems to me to be a matter of congratulation to the Latin teachers of the country that their representatives have been able to unite upon a set of requirements which represents such a judicious mixture of conservatism and progress.—Professor Lodge, in the *Classical Weekly*.

This is an important forward step, almost comparable to the movement for demanding or at least rewarding a speaking knowledge of French and German. The ability to read Latin at sight has been too much sacrificed to other requirements, and particularly to the requirement of stowing away a stipulated body of Latin books for examination purposes. Many teachers have succeeded by concentrating their work on this one thing, going over the texts carefully and mechanically, with short lessons and frequent reviews, till the average pupil could pass a creditable examination on any of those books, with very little vital knowledge of the language. . . . The chief point to consider is that the student entering college ought to be prepared to study Latin literature and to absorb it in large quantities with pleasure and profit. Generally speaking, Latin literature is more interesting and more valuable to adults than to the young, but facility in reading it commonly must be acquired young or not at all. The worst aspect of the time-honored method is that in later life, when this serious and thoughtful literature would be highly valued, the ability to read it is lacking. It is to be hoped that a notable reform is at hand.—*Springfield Republican*.

The adoption of the plan will of course bring greater relief to eastern schools than to western, since a larger proportion of eastern pupils than of western prepare for the colleges which require examinations. But there are numerous western schools in which, from time to time, one or more pupils

are prepared for these institutions. A great deal of trouble, which might arise at any moment in *any* school, would thus be saved by the general acceptance of the scheme—to say nothing of the fact that the spirit of it seems in itself excellent. It is greatly to be hoped that, when a plan apparently so good has been framed by so representative a body of men for the relief both of the schools and the colleges, the colleges throughout the country will at once prepare to put it to trial, adopting in their catalogues the definitions formulated. In the interests of a general harmony of aims and methods, this hope applies not only to institutions requiring examination, but to those also which admit upon certificate.—*School Review*.

This new report may be unreservedly commended to college faculties everywhere. The weight of the signers alone would make it a document of more than usual importance; but quite apart from the signers the recommendations contained in the report justify themselves by their reasonableness, their good sense, and their thoroughly practical character. We hope that there will be no delay by the leading colleges in following the recommendations of this Commission. Any faculty which declines to follow them takes upon itself a pretty heavy responsibility.—*Educational Review*.

The Commission of course has no *authority* whatever, nor has it, I am sure, any desire to *impose* its views upon anyone. Such influence as it may have must be by way of purely voluntary approval and acceptance on the part of schools and colleges. If such voluntary approval and acceptance are not secured, the Commission will have accomplished little or nothing. Nor will much have been accomplished, if various colleges accept merely certain parts of the definitions of the Commission, making each in its own way certain reservations, exceptions, modifications, or additions.—Professor Ingersoll.

Will you spare me space in *The Classical Weekly* to record my satisfaction in the Report of the Commission on College Entrance Requirements in Latin? It seems to me that the adoption by the colleges of the requirements recommended in this report would be a longer step towards putting Latin study in this country on a solid basis than has hitherto been taken within my remembrance.—Mr. Preble.

A committee of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, which has been engaged since the autumn of 1907 in the consideration of college-entrance requirements,¹ in its second report (1909) had recommended (1) a division of the Latin requirements into two parts (elementary, covering the school work of the first three years, and advanced), with two examinations, preliminary and final; (2) uniform requirements; (3) alternative prescriptions, if the prescriptions were to remain

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for February, 1910, p. 150.

quantitative. Upon the last head the report says: "Such alternative prescriptions encourage variety from year to year in the work of the teachers of the secondary schools, relieve the monotony which deadens their enthusiasms, and extend and broaden their scholarship." Upon the appearance of the commission's report, the committee decided that, so far as Latin was concerned, it could best further the object for which it had been appointed by concurring in the recommendations of the commission. The willingness of the committee to sacrifice, in the interests of uniformity, the considerable results of its own labors in this field was a happy omen. Nor did the committee stop here. It invited the Latin departments of the New England Colleges to a conference, and thereby contributed to the general and unqualified adoption of the new requirements by the colleges of this section. The conference was held in Cambridge, Mass., April 8, 1910. There were present representatives of Amherst, Boston University, Bowdoin, Brown, Dartmouth, Harvard, University of Maine, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Trinity, Tufts, Wellesley, Wesleyan, Williams, and Yale. It was voted, "That the members of the conference recommend to their respective colleges the adoption as a whole of the report of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin." In 1910 the committee reported that no colleges had acted adversely on the recommendations.

The College-Entrance Examination Board voted on April 16, 1910, on the recommendation of its Committee of Review, to approve the requirements proposed by the commission, and to set examinations in accordance with the new requirements in June, 1911. It was voted, moreover, that the Board "express the hope that by 1911 a sufficient number of colleges will have adopted the new definition of requirements in Latin to warrant the Board in discontinuing thereafter the examinations based on the old definition."

On March 24, 1911, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools voted unanimously to conform the definitions of the Latin requirements of its Commission on Accredited Schools and Colleges to the recommendations of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin. The vote was

recommended by the committee that had prepared the old definitions, which thus furnished another conspicuous example of the high-minded generosity that has marked the whole course of the discussion of the commission's report.

The one serious check which the new requirements have met is the attitude of the New York State Education Department. Certificates issued by the department are accepted by a large number of colleges both within and without the state, and the examinations which it conducts are therefore, in some measure, college-entrance examinations. In the "Syllabus for Secondary Schools" for 1910, a document which contains much sound direction for the teacher of Latin, the commission's definitions of the Latin requirements are printed in full, with this comment: "The eminence of the men who composed the commission and the representative positions which they occupy render their report worthy of adoption by all schools at as early a date as may be possible. But owing to the fact that in this State as in all other states there are many schools that can not at once meet the conditions of this report which are ideal, the following syllabus has been prepared substantially in accord with the recommendations of the commission. The object of this syllabus is to develop in the pupil greater power to read and understand Latin by limiting the amount of Latin required for intensive study and by increasing the opportunities for sight reading." What follows, so far as it goes counter to the recommendations of the commission, is this:

Second year. Caesar—*Gallic War*, books i and ii; sight reading equivalent in amount to books iii and iv of the *Gallic War* to be selected from Caesar (*Gallic War* and *Civil War*) and Nepos (*Lives*).

Third year. Cicero—*In Catilinam* i and iii, *De Lege Manilia*, *Pro Archia Poeta*; sight reading equivalent in amount to the second and fourth orations against Catiline to be selected from Cicero (orations, letters, and *De senectute*) and Sallust (*Catiline* and *Jugurthine War*).

Fourth year. Virgil—*Aeneid*, books i, ii, iv, and vi; sight reading equivalent in amount to two books of Virgil to be selected from Virgil (*Bucolics*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*) and Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, *Fasti*, and *Tristia*).

It would be presumptuous for me to criticize the intrinsic merits of the department's instructions to the schools under its guidance, but I may perhaps with decency, in view of the depart-

ment's evident intention to forward the recommendations of the commission, compare promise with performance. The syllabus fixes the same amount of reading as the commission and the same limits of choice, so far as it permits a choice of reading. It will be noticed, however, that it adds to the reading prescribed by the commission's definitions two books of Caesar, two speeches of Cicero, and a book of Vergil, and apparently demands that all the reading not prescribed be done at sight. It thus restricts the freedom of the schools, on the one hand, in the choice of reading; on the other hand, in the determination of the quantity of sight-translation. I suspect that the framers of the syllabus took the definitions of the commission to mean that all reading not prescribed was to be at sight. This explanation would account for their increase of the prescription, and for their statement that "there are many schools that can not at once meet the conditions of this report which are ideal." I can find no other explanation of the statement. The definitions of the commission left the schools free to read the portions of text which the syllabus adds to the prescription. I cannot believe that the schools of New York would generally prefer the department's requirements to those recommended by the commission, and my skepticism has been increased by letters from persons fully acquainted with the situation. It should be remembered that the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, which has a large membership in New York, adopted in 1908, with but a single dissenting vote, resolutions calling for a much smaller amount of prescribed reading than the commission finally agreed upon.¹ I question whether there are many schoolmasters anywhere who are disturbed at the prospect of greater elasticity in college-entrance requirements.

In sending out the report of the commission the secretary asked that he be notified of the action of colleges upon it. To fill in the gaps in this intelligence, I recently addressed to the presidents of certain colleges a request for information that would aid me in preparing this statement. From the answers received by Professor Dennison and myself it appears that the following institutions have formally adopted the new requirements:

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for February, 1910, p. 151.

University of Alabama	Colgate University
University of Arkansas	Columbia College and
University of California	Barnard College
Leland Stanford Junior University	Vassar College
Wesleyan University	Wake Forest College
Yale College and	Fargo College
Sheffield Scientific School	University of Oregon
University of Georgia	Dickinson College
University of Chicago	Pennsylvania College
State University of Iowa	Franklin and Marshall College
Transylvania University	Allegheny College
Bowdoin College	University of Pennsylvania
Bates College	University of Pittsburgh
Goucher College	Lehigh University
Amherst College	Swarthmore College
Boston University	Washington and Jefferson College
Harvard University	Bryn Mawr College
Williams College	Brown University
Smith College	University of South Dakota
Mount Holyoke College	University of Tennessee
Wellesley College	Vanderbilt University
University of Michigan	University of the South
Kalamazoo College	University of Vermont
University of Missouri	Middlebury College
Dartmouth College	University of Virginia
Princeton University	Whitman College
Adelphi College	Lawrence College
Hobart College	Beloit College

The list is not complete. I have only named some representative institutions of different types and different parts of the country. Furthermore, I have omitted a large number of important colleges which were reported as having adopted the new requirements, since it was evident from their catalogues or from facts brought out in the correspondence that they had not fully committed themselves. In some cases, "adopted" clearly meant that the college will accept candidates who have been prepared under the new requirements; in others, the requirements recommended by the commission have been so altered that the adoption cannot be counted a gain for uniformity. Not all, indeed, of the institutions named in the list have fully and unreservedly accepted the commission's recommendations, but I have included only

those of whose favorable attitude I have what seems to be complete assurance. Vassar accepts the new requirements, but will not withdraw the alternative of the present requirements until the new ones "have been generally approved by the schools." Princeton and some other institutions will not entirely withdraw the old requirements until after 1912.

Many colleges print the commission's definitions of the requirements in their catalogues in the exact words of the report, some assimilate the wording to the form used for other subjects. Barnard's announcement gives not only the definitions but also the arguments by which they are sustained in the report—a course calculated to bring out their essential relations to the work of the schools. Yale College accomplishes the same thing in this brief statement: "The requirements stated in detail below are in exact accord with these definitions [those formulated by the commission], of which the principal features are (1) specification of the *amount* of reading required, (2) specification of the *range* within which this reading must be done, (3) stress upon *translation at sight*, and (4) designation of *certain specific texts for careful reading and minute examination*."

Some institutions intentionally enlarge the range of the reading. The University of California, which felt that it could not take a backward step by limiting the choice of the schools, specifies the works recommended by the commission, except the *De senectute*, but indicates a willingness to accept other authors and works for the reading which is not prescribed. Stanford puts the following in place of 1, 2, of the definitions: "An equivalent amount of reading from authors other than those specified above may be substituted. The following are suggested: Terence, *Phormio*; Caesar, *Civil War*; Nepos; Cicero, *Letters*; Sallust; Virgil, *Bucolics* and *Georgics*; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*." Boston University recommends Eutropius and Gellius, as well as Caesar and Nepos; does not restrict the choice from Cicero or the reading in poetry; and omits the definite prescription. Middlebury also omits the prescription. The University of Tennessee prescribes no Cicero, but requires at least three speeches, and makes no mention of the letters or the *De senectute*.

It is obvious that the enlargement of the range of reading, though it makes against uniformity, will not embarrass the schools. On the other hand, its confinement within narrower bounds than those set by the commission will make it impossible for schools which prepare for several colleges to feel secure in taking advantage of the freedom promised by the commission's recommendations. In view of the fact that certain institutions explicitly declare that they have adopted the new requirements, while they strictly prescribe all or the greater part of the required reading, it seems likely that the report has been misunderstood. Instead of leaving the schools free to select their reading from the canonical works, the colleges have made the selection. The University of Virginia allows the substitution of an equivalent amount of *Viri Romae* or other Latin prose for one book of Caesar, an equivalent amount of Nepos or other Latin prose for two orations of Cicero (the orations against Catiline seem to be prescribed), and an equivalent amount of Ovid or other epic poetry for the third and fifth books of the *Aeneid*. The commission's definitions are printed in the catalogue of the university, and the requirements are said to be in accordance with them. The University of Missouri allows the substitution of *Viri Romae*, Nepos, or Eutropius for one book of Caesar; of the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics*, or Ovid for two books of the *Aeneid* (no particular books of the *Aeneid* are prescribed). Through a misprint in the *Register* of the university, the requirement in Cicero is not clear. Smith uses the new requirements for candidates entering by examination, the old for those entering on certificates; but equivalents are accepted for the old prescription, and practice in sight-reading is recommended.

With these qualifications regarding the action of particular colleges, the list given above is, I believe, not misleading. It would have been easy to swell the list, as I have already pointed out. The requirements of many colleges show the influence of the commission's report, and I know of none which will not accept in satisfaction of its own requirements a certificate showing that the applicant has passed the "New Requirements" examinations of the College-Entrance Examination Board. These examinations will be set in scrupulous conformity with the recommenda-

tions of the commission. It is possible, therefore, for a school to escape the inconvenience which small variations in the requirements of different colleges cause by offering its students for the Board's examinations. Moreover, the progress of the movement has not stopped. The faculties of several colleges are now considering the commission's report, and the recent action of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools will undoubtedly lead to the adoption of the new definitions by a large number of institutions which frame their requirements in accordance with the recommendations of that association.

The College-Entrance Examination Board will set six "New Requirements" examinations: grammar, elementary prose composition, second-year Latin, Cicero (*Manilian Law* and *Archias*) and sight-translation of prose, Vergil (*Aeneid*, i, ii, and either iv or vi, at the option of the candidate) and sight-translation of poetry, advanced prose composition. The examinations in grammar and elementary prose composition "will presuppose the reading of the required amount of prose, including the prose works prescribed." The examination in second-year Latin "is offered primarily for candidates intending to enter colleges which require only two years of Latin or accept so much as a complete preparatory course. . . . The passages set will be chosen with a view to sight translation. The paper will include easy grammatical questions and some simple composition." Some institutions which require four years of Latin (for instance, Yale and Princeton) will demand that applicants for admission take this examination, or their own similar examination on the work of the second year. Many (including Amherst, Bates, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton, Wesleyan, Williams) will not demand the advanced prose composition; some that will demand this omit the elementary composition. Barnard will be satisfied with Cicero and sight-translation of prose, Vergil and sight-translation of poetry, and advanced prose composition.

In the paper printed in the *Classical Journal* for April, 1910, I pointed out that the success of the commission's work would not be complete unless its definitions of the requirements were adopted by the colleges which admit on certificates from schools. These

colleges are generally willing to permit substitutes for the reading stated in their requirements, but unless this willingness is proclaimed, it has no effect in opening up new possibilities to the teacher. There is another aspect of the matter, which I can best present in the light of my own experience. In the school in which I am teaching there are every year scores of boys who are intending to enter colleges which accept the school's certificate. These colleges are scattered from Maine to California. The boys may or may not obtain a certificate in Latin, for with us, as with most New England schools, a certificate is granted for only those subjects in which the student has maintained rank higher than a mere pass. They may, therefore, have to take a college-entrance examination. In this way the requirements of any college may, in view of the possible needs of an individual student, claim a share in the determination of our course of study. That the requirements of the commission lend themselves readily to the use of colleges admitting on certificate is proved by the ease with which they have been restated by such colleges. I cite two examples. The full, clear statement in the *Calendar* of the University of Michigan treats separately the content of the school course and the examinations to be taken by those applicants who are not entitled to enter on a diploma, but uses throughout the language of the report. Dartmouth says: "Candidates for admission by certificate must present certificates covering the amount of reading specified in I, 1, selected from the authors and works specified in I, 2; the reading must include the works prescribed in II, 2."

The success of the movement which led to the creation of the commission has far exceeded expectation. The assured agreement of the Latin requirements of the four great universities which admit students only by examination (Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale) is alone enough to justify the agitation. Furthermore, the honest, generous co-operation of all, both within and without the commission, who have been engaged in the solution of the problems that have arisen is an earnest of a better understanding, and has already dispelled some petty suspicions. It must be acknowledged, it is true, that the results are not perfect, even from the standpoint of the commission's practical purpose.

The three Classical Associations and the Philological Association handed on to the commission, with their indorsement, a demand for identical, and not merely uniform, requirements; and the commission petitioned "the authorities of colleges and universities to adopt, without material alteration, the definitions of requirements formulated by it." It has been brought out in the course of this article that deviations from the definitions have been made here and there. These deviations, though they are infrequent, and, for the most part, slight, are not negligible. In the *Journal* for April, 1910, I tried to show that even an improvement of the definitions by individual colleges would not be in the interests of the schools. It is my steadfast conviction that the cause of classical education will be best served by absolutely uniform college-entrance requirements, which yet grant to the schools a large measure of freedom in arranging the details of their course of study.

This is not, in any sense, a report* for the commission, and the writer is personally responsible for the facts and opinions here given.

PROFESSOR BUTCHER AT CAMBRIDGE

BY WILLIAM FENWICK HARRIS
Cambridge, Mass.

In 1904 Professor Butcher delivered in Cambridge, in the course founded by Mr. Gardiner M. Lane in honor of his father, Professor George M. Lane, of blessed memory, the addresses later published as *Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects*. The *Classical Journal* has asked me to give a brief account of the impressions left in Cambridge by the visitor. This is a task both easy and grateful; few strangers have come to Cambridge and in so short a time spent there have made so many admiring and abiding friendships as did Professor Butcher. Boston and Cambridge are thoroughly be-lectured; all the time we feel in regard to lecturers as did the younger Pliny when he wrote of spring poets "magnum proventum poetarum annus hic attulit. Toto mense Aprili nullus fere dies quo non recitaret aliquis." And in many cases I fear times have not changed: "ad audiendum pigre coitum." The lecturers come and go, and generally speaking, leave "but a pin's prick on the chart of memory," and "there an end." But the visit of Professor Butcher stands out in the recollection of many like a good deed in a naughty world; it was to us what must have been to Lowell and to Norton the season spent in Cambridge years ago by A. H. Clough when he was revising the translation of Plutarch's *Lives*.

There was a charm about Butcher that appealed to everyone. Perhaps the greatest element of that charm came from his very great interest in everything human; all his windows were open on the world about him. He was keenly alert to all that was doing: the politics of the country, the ideas of its scholars, the ambitions of its young students, and not least, the fortunes of his compatriots in a new land. This last was shown in the interest he took in the Irish servants he found with his hosts in Cambridge. There was about him none of that condescension in foreigners which got on

Lowell's nerves. He enjoyed himself too much for that. Half a dozen years after his visit he wrote back: "During the early part of this year I had full and interesting letters every week or oftener from my sister during her stay in Boston or Cambridge. All the memories of my visit to Harvard and of the friends I there made revived with fresh force. She and her husband carried away with them gratitude and affection such as have been permanent with me after a much briefer stay than theirs." His visit was very short, but it was astounding how soon one felt he had always known him; there was in him what William James once called the quality of a big brother of humanity. He was scholar, thinker, man of the world, but above all else, an ideal member to represent a university in the parliament of his country. And his value as a Grecian comes from the fact that he was interested in the larger phases of Greek life. The title of his book *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* is characteristic of him. He tried to get to the heart of Greece; he was interested in her originality, her love of knowledge, "which not only seeks out the facts of nature and of man's life, but persistently asks their meaning." His own words about things Greek excellently describe his own mental attitude.

This belief in the interpretative power of mind [he wrote], working on and transmitting all raw material of knowledge, is shown to extend beyond the domain of philosophy or of science; . . . art and inspiration, logic and intuition, elsewhere so often disjoined, enter into perfect union in the constructive efforts of the Greek imagination.

And again:

A fresh and lucid intelligence looks out upon the universe. There is the desire to see each object as it is, to catch it in some characteristic moment of grace or beauty. And the thing seen is not felt to be truly understood until it has taken shape in words, and the exact impression conveyed to the eye has been transmitted to another mind.

And what perhaps gave him his greatest value as a Grecian is described in his own words: "Though each thing, great and small, has its interest, the great and small are not of equal importance."

One of his minor qualities, which stands out, however, in my memory of him as truly characteristic, was his zest, equal to that of Father Herodotus, for a good story. The best minor classic

which he brought to Cambridge was that of an official banquet in Dublin, at which a distinguished scholar sat near the Lord Mayor. The latter, anxious to air a scholarship he did not possess, propounded, "What do you think, sir, of the Latinity of Athenaeus?" The question was skilfully dodged, and so a second time. The third attack was ponderously delivered during a marked pause in general conversation and was not to be avoided. "I think you must say, my dear Lord Mayor," was the answer, "that the Latinity of Athenaeus smacks of Grecisms."

I hope I shall be pardoned for adding a story which Butcher would thoroughly have appreciated—that of the lady with literary aspirations who on meeting Professor Slaughter gushed forth, "I am charmed to meet you, Sir. I have so enjoyed reading your translation of the *Odyssey*!"

All who knew him through pen or personality must feel that in the death of Professor Butcher Greek scholarship has suffered a grievous loss.

*Non omnis moriar; multaque pars mei
vitabit Libitinam; usque ego postera
crescam laude recens; dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex*

—Q. HORATIUS FLACCUS.

No more the maiden and the priest
Climb as of old the sacred hill,
The stately ministries have ceased,
The altars are unlit and chill.

Proud roof and pillared hall are low;
Alas! the legions and the ships,
The eagles that despised the foe,
The trumpets and the silent lips.

But as Bandusia's fountain clear
Might paint the bending ilex tree
And all the careless blooms that peer
Into the water's imagery,

The crystal of the poet's art
Reveals the homely feasts and fires
That cheered the lyric sage's heart,
Sets dancing still his sylvan choirs.

O Tibur of the restless streams,
O Baiae, splendid by the sea,
Apulia, witched by boyhood's dreams,
Untouched of time your charm shall be;

For poets have a gift to stay
The flying years that do men wrong,
And we may find lost yesterday
Unshattered in the glass of song.

FLORENCE ELIZABETH DUNN

COLBY COLLEGE

Note

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

XENOPHON AND HERODOTUS

Mr. Keller's article in the March number on "Xenophon's Acquaintance with the *History* of Herodotus" leads me to call attention to another parallel. In *Anab.* i. 7. 11-12 it is stated that the army of Artaxerxes numbered 1,200,000 and that there were four generals, each of 300,000. Herodotus (7. 60, 87, 184) tells us that the Asiatic land force of Xerxes numbered 1,800,000—1,700,000 foot and 100,000 mounted men (horse, camel, and chariot)—and he names (7. 82) six generals-in-chief (*στρατηγοί*). He does not state that each *στρατηγός* was in command of 300,000 men; in fact he names them only in connection with the 1,700,000 foot. In 8. 113, however, we are told that Mardonius, one of the six *στρατηγοί*, was left in Greece with 300,000 men, horse and foot, so that the inference is a fair one that Herodotus considered this number the full complement of a general's division. Xenophon tells us (1. 7. 13) that he got his facts from deserters from the king's army. Is it fair to accuse him of borrowing from Herodotus to make his "facts" more interesting? The figures are, of course, incredibly large, but may not both authors have had access to Persian sources, in which 300,000 appeared as a divisional unit? One's confidence in this natural assumption is somewhat shaken by the fact that Ctesias gives 400,000 as the total number of Persians at Cunaxa, and Ctesias was in a better position than either Herodotus or Xenophon to learn the details of the Persian military system. Fortunately there is a bit of very definite proof that Xenophon borrowed from Herodotus. The reading in *Anab.* i. 7. 12 is *τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως στρατεύματος δύον δρχοντες καὶ στρατηγοί καὶ ἡγεμόνες τέτταρες, τριάκοντα μυριάδων ἔκαστος*. This heaping up of different titles for the same officer is so peculiar that Weiske bracketed *καὶ στρατηγοί καὶ ἡγεμόνες*. He is followed by Gemoll, while Rehdantz keeps *στρατηγοί* and rejects the other two. The manuscript authority is all against changing the text, one solitary manuscript, E, omitting *καὶ στρατηγοί*. Now these three titles are used by Herodotus in 7. 96 in the description of the army of Xerxes, but of officers of different rank, though a careless reader, without the details of chaps. 60-82 in mind, might suppose that *δρχοντες* and *στρατηγοί* referred to the same officer. At any rate the parallel gives a satisfactory explanation of an otherwise suspicious reading, and the double agreement, in content and form, is conclusive evidence of Herodotean influence.

A. G. LAIRD

Current Events

Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Volkmann School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., for the southern states; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.

New England

The Classical Association of New England held its sixth annual meeting at Exeter, N.H., on Friday and Saturday, March 31 and April 1. The meeting was in every way a great success: the attendance was large, about two hundred members and their friends; the program unusually good; the hospitality of the Academy most cordial and generous. The general tone of the meeting was one of enthusiasm and optimism. The papers read were of more than common interest, of such merit, in fact, that it is impossible to do them justice in a brief sentence. The annual report of the Association will, however, contain the usual summaries, which the secretary will send to any who desire them. Three, possibly four, of the papers will be printed in later numbers of the *Journal*.

The address on Homer, by Professor Weir Smyth, of Harvard University, was perhaps the feature of the meeting, and made a profound impression on all who heard it. Setting far aside all discussion of the so-called Homeric Question, Professor Smyth treated his subject wholly from the literary side and filled his hearers with the spirit of the poems themselves. His words gave many a tired teacher new inspiration, and added new courage to doubting souls, if such there were. If perchance any Philistine were present, he must have gone away repentant, to sin no more.

In spite of a short note of pessimism in regard to the future of Greek, heard in one paper, many words of encouragement were noted in the exchange of greetings. From many quarters come reports of increasing interest in Greek studies and gains in the number of students.

At the business meeting of the Association the following officers were chosen for 1911-12: President, Dr. William Gallagher, of Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; Vice-President, Professor Clarence H. White, of Colby University, Waterville, Maine; Secretary and Treasurer, Professor George E. Howes, of Williams College. The program will be found in the March number of the *Journal*.

Massachusetts

Smith College.—Under the auspices of the Department of Latin of Smith College, which has in other years presented the *Adelphoe* and the *Trinummus*, as also the *Carmen Saeculare*, a performance of the *Rudens* of Plautus was given in February by members of the class in Roman comedy before an audience of six hundred or more. An English version of this charming and romantic comedy was presented with ancient costume, appropriate scenery, stage setting, and music. The interest of the audience was unabated from the first appearance of the star Arcturus, who delivers the prologue, preaching such an excellent morality and setting forth such just views of Jove's dealings with mankind, down to the humorous invitation of Daemones to the spectators "to dine with him and to make merry sixteen twelvemonths from today," with which the play concludes.

The parts were all well played, particularly those of Trachalio, Gripus, Labrax, and Palaestra. The scene near the end of the second act, in which appear the rascally slave-dealer Labrax and his Sicilian friend Charmides after their shipwreck, was very effective, and the dialogue which took place between the two was so well and amusingly rendered that the audience was constrained, much against its will, to feel sympathy with the poor wretches in their pitiable plight. Other scenes merited especial mention. The Fishermen's song beginning the second act was pleasingly sung by a chorus of eight voices, the translation used having been written by Elizabeth Cordelia Decker. The musical score for the song was written by Henry Dike Sleeper of the Department of Music. The scene painted for the occasion by a student of the Department of Art represented the seashore near Cyrene, with the temple of Venus and the adjacent cottage of Daemones, even the bulrushes and the laserpicium plants not being overlooked by the youthful artist.

Much credit is due Dr. Florence Alden Gragg, the instructor of the class, and those who so efficiently assisted her for the delightful and instructive presentation of this Plautine comedy from the repertory of Diphilus.

Pennsylvania

Classical Club of Philadelphia.—The fourth meeting of the year was held on February 10, when Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D., read a paper on "Christianity v. Paganism in the Second Century A.D." The fifth meeting was held March 10, and at this Dr. Paul Shorey, professor of the Greek language and literature at the University of Chicago, delivered an address entitled "The Pace That Killed Athens."

University of Pennsylvania.—Professor Shorey delivered a series of six lectures on "Greek and English Poetry; a Comparative Study," at the University of Pennsylvania, from March 11 to March 22.

Ohio

University of Cincinnati.—Friday evening, March 10, there was given at the Grand Opera House a typical Greek tragedy, the *Antigone* of Sophocles.

A large audience witnessed the production. Probably no play which belongs strictly to the amateur class has ever been given in Cincinnati with greater success. The presentation moved with unexpected smoothness and ease. Throughout the entire performance an atmosphere of impressive solemnity prevailed. The play was given under the direction of Professor Harry, of the University of Cincinnati, by whom a translation of the drama had been prepared for the occasion.

Cincinnati.—A Latin Reading Club was formed last winter by teachers of Latin in Cincinnati. There are ten members, who teach Latin either in the University of Cincinnati or one of the three Cincinnati high schools. The meetings are held every two weeks, and each time a pleasant hour is spent in reading Latin. The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius is the book now read, and the experiences of poor Lucius, "the perfect ass," are thoroughly enjoyed.

Minnesota

University of Minnesota.—Dr. Granrud, of the Latin Department, has prepared a new course of lectures on Roman art to be delivered at various points in the state. He is also preparing a scheme for providing the high schools of the state with sets of lantern slides to be sent out from the university as called for.

Professor J. B. Pike, of the Department of Latin, will spend a part of the summer vacation in Athens.

Professor C. A. Savage, of the Department of Greek, has been elected secretary and treasurer of the Minneapolis section of the newly founded branch of the Archaeological Institute of America.

Missouri

Kansas City Central High School.—"Classical Day" was a feature of the Central High School on March 11. It consisted of an elaborate presentation of character scenes from the *Iliad*.

Tarkio College.—The college town of Tarkio has experienced this year a renaissance of interest in classical lore. The Women's Club, Sorosis, comprising three circles and forty-five members, has just completed a year's study of Homer and the Greek tragedians. They are enthusiastic over their efforts, and pronounce the year's work most satisfying. At an assembly meeting March 20 in Tarkio College Professor J. Vallance Brown of the Greek Department lectured before the club on *Oedipus at Colonus*.

University of Missouri.—Miss Bertha Bost has been appointed assistant in Latin. Dr. G. C. Scoggan has been promoted to an assistant professorship in Greek. E. H. Eckel, Jr., of St. Joseph, Mo., was appointed Rhodes Scholar and is now in residence at Wadham College.

Iowa

Cornell College.—What the presentation of a Greek or Roman play in English version can do to enliven the study of the classical drama in our

colleges recently received a gratifying illustration at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa. A considerable number of young ladies, members of one of the regular literary societies of the college, finding themselves associated also in the course in the Roman drama under Professor Evelyn C. Riley, determined to present as one of the "open-door" programs of the society a Latin play. While the original inspiration probably came from their instructor, the choice of the play was made by the students themselves. The choice fell upon Plautus' *Menaechmi*. The students also made their own translation, and a very excellent one it was. The plays upon words were generally well produced, the English was idiomatic and vigorous, and throughout the lively wit of the original was fairly reproduced. The costumes were arranged by the participants. The staging and performance were under the very competent direction of Professor George M. Knox.

Perry High School.—The high-school pupils of Perry recently presented Professor Miller's Latin play, *Dido*, to a large and appreciative audience. The rich costumes of the leading players and the white flowing robes of the Vestal Virgins afforded an artistic effect highly pleasing, which was enhanced by the music that accompanied the greater part of the play.

University of Iowa.—A series of circulating lectures with lantern slides has been prepared for use in Iowa in accordance with the system inaugurated by the Archaeological Institute of America. These lectures are three in number, one by Professor C. H. Weller, professor of Greek and archaeology in the State University, entitled "Athens, Old and New," and two entitled respectively "Indians of the Northwest" and "Indians of the Southwest," by Mr. John Harrington, member of the American School of Archaeology. These are to be sent upon application to high schools, colleges, and organizations interested, at cost of carriage only.

Doctor Clara E. Millerd, professor of Greek at Iowa College, Grinnell, read a valuable paper, "Plato and Athens," before the Classical Club of the State University on March 24.

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke and Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City, or G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

CAESAR-NEPOS. *Caesar's Civil War and Nepos' Lives*. Latin Sight-Reading for Second Year. New York: American Book Co., 1911. 30 cents.

FRAZER. *The Golden Bough*. Part I, 3d ed. New York: Macmillan, 1911. 2 vols. 20s.

GRAVES, C. E. *Aristophanes, The Peace*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1911. Pp. xv+143. 3s. 6d.

JACKSON, H. A. *Ovid, Selections from the Metamorphoses*. London: Edward Arnold, 1911. Pp. 77. 1s. 6d.

LEWIS, L. W. P., AND BROADBENT, C. H. *Ovid, Selections from Heroides, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary*. London: Edward Arnold, 1911. Pp. 128. 2s.

MENDEL, C. W. *Sentence Connection in Tacitus*. Yale University, 1911. Pp. 158. \$1.25.

PELHAM, H. F. *Essays on Roman History*. Collected and edited by F. Haverfield. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Pp. xxiii+328. 10s. 6d.

SCHRADER, O. *Die Indogermanen*. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1911. Pp. 165. M. 1.25.

SPENCE-JONES, MAURICE. *The Early Christians in Rome*. New York: John Lane Co., 1911. Pp. xxxii+409. \$4.00.

WILKINSON, S. *Hannibal's March through the Alps*. With 2 figures and 4 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Pp. 48. 7s. 6d.

WUNDT, M. *Griechische Weltanschauung*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. 132. M. 1.25.

YOUNG, A. W., AND PLAISTOWE, F. G. *Virgil, Georgics*. Edited with Introduction, Text, and Notes. London: Clive, 1911. Pp. 188. 4s. 6d.

ZIEBARTH, E. *Aus der antiken Schule*. Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka. Bonn: Marcus und Weber. Pp. 23. M. 0.60.